
From: Carlin, Jayne
To: Henning, Alan
Sent: 6/23/2014 1:34:20 PM
Subject: RE: Summary of the Environmental Quality Commission meeting

Excellent summary. Am eager to hear about today's meeting.

Jayne Carlin, Watersheds Unit
US EPA, Region 10
1200 6th Ave, Suite 900 (OWW-134)
Seattle, WA 98101-3140
(206) 553-8512, (206) 553-0165 (fax)
carlin.jayne@epa.gov

<http://www.epa.gov/r10earth/tmdl.htm>

From: Henning, Alan
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Palmer, John; Barber, Anthony; Wu, Jennifer; Labiosa, Rochelle; Opalski, Dan; Croxton, Dave; Carlin, Jayne; Psyk, Christine; Leinenbach, Peter
Cc: Henning, Alan
Subject: Summary of the Environmental Quality Commission meeting

Before summarizing the EQC meeting, I want to thank John and Tony for their presentations. Both were excellent in their respective roles. In a post meeting discussion with Gene Foster, he said it was extremely beneficial having EPA at the meeting.

The afternoon session started with a presentation on the Paired Watershed Studies by OFIC, OSU College of Forestry and Weyerhaeuser. The Paired Watershed Studies are studies, currently underway, that are being represented as the latest information to show that current forest practices are not that bad, do not result in great temperature increases, and actually may be beneficial to fish. The paired watershed studies are occurring in three watersheds; Hinkle Creek (Umpqua Basin by Roseburg), the Alsea River (Mid-Coast) and the Trask River (North Coast). Essentially, in each watershed, a section of the watershed is being used as the control while other sections are being harvested. Pre and post harvest data (fish, water quality, temp.) are being collected to compare, contrast and determine changes. The studies are being conducted on both type "F" (fish) and "N" (non-fish) streams.

In summary, the key takeaway points I heard from the presenters were;
"The findings show that, when following harvesting practices defined in current OFP regs., temperatures did increase, (up to 4 degrees C. in the Trask for example). The increases are not inconsistent with the findings from other studies, such as RipStream, but the increases are not that big of a deal. In fact, based on fish growth data, fish health seem to be improving in these streams. If this is the case, then we shouldn't really be concerned about such little increases, i.e., the .3 degree increase in PCW. Those limited increases are mitigated as water flows downstream."

I believe these points will be used as the foundation for attacking Oregon's PCW Criterion. My assumption is that this same presentation will be given at the BOF workshop in an attempt to convince the BOF that the PCW (the .3 degree increase as defined in the PCW) is wrong and that a standards change is really the solution. If the Board is convinced that the PCW criterion is really the problem, the BOF could petition the EQC for a standards change and not proceed with a riparian rule change.

Following the paired watersheds study presentation, DEQ (Josh Seeds and Gene Foster)

and ODFW (Dave Jepsen) provided a lengthy discussion on "Stream Temperature Science, WQ Temperature Standard and TMDLS, and Riparian Management". In summary, these folks got into great detail on the science of stream temperature and the importance of PCW. Much of what was presented demonstrated the importance of PCW in protecting and restoring natural thermal regimes, the cumulative impacts of temperature increases, and the need to minimize anthropogenic warming. This presentation was a very strong, objective, counter to the paired watershed study presentation.

John and Tony followed the State folks. EPA's presentation provide background on the work that EPA and others did in 2003 to develop the foundation for the State's current temperature standard, and reinforced the importance in the PCW. Again, the guys did a great job in a very short time.

Following the EQC meeting I did touch bases with Dick Pedersen, to see if he had any comments/suggestions/additions on EPA's presentation. His one suggestion was that we mention the steps that are required to change an existing standard or to adopt a new one. Jenny will be working with Rochelle on this. We'll talk amongst ourselves on Monday regarding the best way to present this information.

On Monday, the BOF workshop will be taking place in Salem. At the meeting, I think will see the biggest effort from the forestry industry to challenge the standard and convince the BOF to curtail or stop the riparian rule making. I suspect there will be a very large crowd.

Dan will be EPA's first presenter delivering key talking points, and John will present on the temperature standard. Peter and I will be close by to address questions that may come up from the BOF on the paired watershed study and CZARA, respectively.

I have attached the BOF agenda, the directions to ODF, questions from ODF that may be asked by the BOF, and our final version of EPA's "talking points and support documents". Please let me know if you have any questions. If you need to reach me this weekend, please feel free to call me anytime at 541-684-8446.

For those of you attending the workshop, travel safely. See you Monday.